

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated June 20, 2007. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-18, 21, 23-27, 29, 30, 32, 34-45 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-18, 21, 23-27, 29, 30, 32, 34-45 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 25, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39-41, and 43-45 have been changed, claims 5, 7, 8, 18, 29, 30 have been cancelled, and claims 46-49 have been added by this amendment.

The amendments and new claims are supported by the specification. Claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended to recite that the computer system includes a pointing device as recited in the original claims, for example. The context includes a displayed item displayed in the GUI corresponding to the particular function, and the particular function is performed when the displayed item is selected by the pointing device, as described, for example, at page 5, lines 19-23, page 7, lines 10-11, and page 8, lines 1-7. Mapping function to hot key includes receiving an indication of the particular function to which the hot key is to be mapped, the indication provided by the user moving the pointing device over the displayed item to indicate the particular function corresponding to the displayed item for mapping, as described, for example, on page 8, lines 7-13, and page 9, lines 14-16. A key combination is received as the hot key in response to the user selecting the key combination using a hardware input device, as described, for example, in the specification on page 8, lines 14-17 and page 9, line 16 to page 10, lines 6. New claim 49 recites that the context is a particular context, and wherein the application program has a plurality of different contexts which can each independently receive user input, as described, for example, on page 2, line 10 to page 3, line 2, and page 5, line 17 to page 6, line 3. Other dependent claims are amended to conform to amendments in their respective parent claims.

All changes are therefore fully supported by Applicant's specification.

Objections to Specification

The Examiner objected to the Specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the Specification as set forth above to recite the term “computer-readable storage medium,” and requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Objections to Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 7, 8, 17, 18, 29, and 30 because the claims depend from later claims, and claims must depend from prior claims. Applicant has cancelled claims 7, 17, and 29. Applicant has also added new claims 46-48, which correspond to cancelled claims 8, 18, and 30, respectively (with minor amendments for clarity). Applicant therefore requests that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10, 12-18, 23-27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 37-39, 41-43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slaunwhite et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US20030090471) (“Slaunwhite”). Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention.

Claim 1 recites a method including integrating a hot key function into a GUI such that it can be accessed within a context and without leaving a context, where the context includes a displayed item displayed in the GUI corresponding to the particular function, and the particular function is performed when the displayed item is selected by the pointing device. Mapping the hot key to the function includes receiving an indication of the function to which the hot key is to be

mapped, provided by the user moving the pointing device over the displayed item to indicate the particular function corresponding to the displayed item for mapping. A key combination is received as the hot key in response to the user selecting the key combination using a hardware input device.

Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest these features. Slaunwhite discloses that, when mapping (assigning) a hot key to a function of the computer system, an assignment handler links the shortcut key with the item type in a customization dialog where the user selects the item type from a list of available item types and then keys in the shortcut key that is associated with it (paragraph [0037]). Thus Slaunwhite is disclosing the standard way of mapping hot keys, where a separate list or menu is displayed and the user selects the function in the list to which to assign a hot key.

There is nothing in Slaunwhite that discloses or suggests that a particular function is performed when a corresponding displayed item is selected by the pointing device, and the particular function is indicated for mapping when the pointing device is moved over the displayed item. As stated above Slaunwhite discloses providing a separate mapping customization dialog where the user selects the item type from a list of available item types and then keys in the shortcut key that is associated with it. The items displayed in Slaunwhite's customization dialog cannot be selected to perform any function; they are simply a list of items each of which describes a function which can be mapped to a keyed-in shortcut key. The displayed windows and boxes of Slaunwhite such as the zoom drop down listbox 200 perform functions, but these displayed windows do not also allow a user to indicate functions for shortcut key mapping as claimed by Applicant. Slaunwhite mentions or suggests nothing about displayed items that are selectable with a pointing device to perform the corresponding function as well as indicatable by

the pointing device to indicate that function for its mapping to a hot key.

Applicant's invention thus provides an advantage of mapping a hot key to a particular function by interacting a pointing device with the same displayed item that performs that function. The user thus does not have to leave the context in which he is providing input, allowing an easy-to-use interface for a user. Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest any such ability, and Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is patentable over Slaunwhite.

The Examiner states that because Slaunwhite teaches that the displaying, use, and dismissal of the non-command item happens in the same application, one of ordinary skill would readily understand that the assigning of the shortcut keys takes place in that same application, or "in the same context." However, Applicant claims that hot key mapping occurs without leaving a single context, not without leaving a single application; a context is not the same as an application as indicated in claim 1 by the recitation that the displayed item is selectable by the pointing device to perform the function and is indicatable by the pointing device to indicate the function for mapping. Using the same displayed item for both performing and mapping the corresponding function indicates that the user has not left the context in which he or she was working.

The Examiner stated (e.g. with respect to claims 10, 21, and 32) that it would have been obvious to have included the receiving of an indication of the particular function to which the hot key is to be mapped when the user hovers the pointing device over the displayed feature, as a way to simplify the way in which a user indicates a particular function. However, there is no suggestion in Slaunwhite even remotely related to such a feature. Rather, the only detail that Slaunwhite discloses for mapping shortcut keys is by using a separate customization dialog having a single purpose to list the functions which can be mapped and allow the user to select them for mapping, and Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest allowing any of these listed functions to also provide

access or performance of the functions. Thus Slaunwhite teaches away from the claimed method of indicating a function for mapping by moving a mouse pointer over a displayed item that can also be selected to perform the function.

Furthermore, Slaunwhite's disclosure is directed toward using keyboard focus on newly-opened windows to allow users to "continue to use the keyboard to modify the value of the non-command item or select an option" (paras. [0040, 0051, 0053]). Slaunwhite simplifies the way the user selects functions, but Slaunwhite focuses on using continuous keyboard input for speed and user convenience, not use of a pointing device. Therefore Slaunwhite teaches away from the invention claimed by Applicant-- it would not be obvious to use Slaunwhite, who concentrates on continuous keyboard input, to achieve Applicant's invention which includes using a pointing device to select a displayed item to perform a function as well as using the pointing device over that displayed item for indicating the function to be mapped to a hot key. This allows a user, for example, to directly point to the function that he or she wishes to map to a hot key, without having to navigate a list of functions as described by Slaunwhite.

Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is patentable over Slaunwhite. Claims 2-6 and 34-37 and 46 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable over Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and for additional reasons. For example, claim 46 (formerly claim 8) recites assigning a portion of the text of the item as a portion of the hot key, which is not disclosed or suggested by Slaunwhite. For example, Slaunwhite's page 3, paragraph [0040], cited by the Examiner, is only directed to performing a function when the corresponding hot key is pressed by the user, and has nothing to do with the task of assigning or mapping a function to a hot key. In addition, Slaunwhite sets focus on boxes to allow a user to enter text, but mentions or suggests nothing about selecting text of a displayed item and assigning a portion of the text as a portion of

a hot key mapped to that displayed item.

As to dependent claim 34, the Examiner stated that Slaunwhite shows mapping a hot key to a particular function without the user leaving the context and without the user providing input to a menu separate from the context, at Fig. 3, elements 150-154 “which do not teach a menu.”

However, elements 150-154 and related description are a broad overview of the mapping process of Slaunwhite. One of ordinary skill would read Slaunwhite’s description at paragraph [0037] to see the only description in Slaunwhite for such mapping, which typically involves a customization dialog with an item type list (which is a menu separate from the context). There is no other description of how to map the hot keys to functions in Slaunwhite, and so this teaching is Slaunwhite’s description, by default. Therefore Slaunwhite does not disclose the feature of claim 34.

As to claim 37, the Examiner stated that Slaunwhite shows indicating an item for mapping including selecting text of an item. However, Slaunwhite’s “focus setter” (not the user) sets focus on a non-command item of a displayed popup item window after the shortcut key has already been mapped, since the “corresponding shortcut key” has been pressed by the user to cause the window and non-command items to be displayed (it is “corresponding” and thus it has already been mapped) (para. [0039]). There is no description in Slaunwhite of selecting text of item to indicate that item for mapping to a shortcut key.

Claim 12 recites a computer-readable storage medium including features similar to those of claim 1, and is thus patentable over Slaunwhite for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 13-16, 21, and 38, 39, 41 and 47 are dependent on claim 12 and are patentable over Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons as claim 12, and for additional reasons similar to those explained above.

Claim 23 recites a computer system including a hot key configuring function integrated into a GUI with features similar to those of claim 1, and is thus patentable over Slaunwhite for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 24-27, 32, 42-45, and 48 are dependent on claim 23 and are patentable over Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons as claim 23, and for additional reasons similar to those explained above.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant submits that claims 1-8, 10, 12-18, 23-27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 37-39, 41-43 and 45-48 are patentable over Slaunwhite, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 21, 32, 36, 40, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaunwhite. These claims are dependent on claims 1, 12, and 23, which are patentable over Slaunwhite as explained above. Claims 10, 21, 32, 36, 40, and 44 are thus patentable over Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons, and for additional reasons. For example, claims 10, 21, and 32 recite that the user hovers the pointing device over the displayed item for a predetermined amount of time to indicate the particular function for mapping to a hot key, which is nowhere disclosed or suggested by Slaunwhite as explained above with reference to claim 1.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant submits that claims 10, 21, 32, 36, 40, and 44 are patentable over Slaunwhite, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claim 49 has been added by this amendment, which recites that the context is a particular context, and wherein the application program has a plurality of different contexts which can each independently receive user input. This is not disclosed or suggested by Slaunwhite, and is believed patentable thereover.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

August 13, 2007

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./

Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540